



PLEASE ENTER  
a 6/2/07

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No. 056258-5091-US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of )  
Inventors: Janos VERES et al. )  
Appln. No. 10/523,644 ) Group Art Unit: 2823  
Filed: September 6, 2005 ) Examiner: Coleman, W.D.  
For: ORGANIC ELECTRONIC DEVICES )

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Window - *ATTN: Box AF*  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated March 27, 2007, reconsideration of this application is requested. The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned for the purpose of discussing any issue which remains following the Examiner's consideration of the following comments which, it is considered, warrant withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of the application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 12-26 and 28-35 as anticipated under Section 102(a) on the basis of the Holdcroft publication which is acknowledged in the applicants' specification at page 1, 4th paragraph. Additionally, claims 7-11 are rejected as obvious from the Holdcroft publication. The remaining claim (claim 27) stands rejected for depending from a rejected claim but has been indicated to be allowable if presented in independent form.

The Examiner's position with regard to the Section 102(a) rejection is set forth on pages 3-10 of the action while the Section 103(a) rejection appears at pages 10-12 of the action.

The applicants respectfully submit that Holdcroft does not disclose the applicants' invention as claimed in claims 1-6, 12-26 and 28-35 or make the invention of claims 7-11 obvious. The applicants' position in this regard is set out below and, in